



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

rare beauty" is doubtless defensible, but in the context misleading.

The book is fully illustrated, containing 262 cuts, including plans and maps, but these latter are, as was said before, quite unsatisfactory.

The plan adopted by Prof. Weller in writing his book gave him too little freedom to make it interesting to the general reader, but to the student of the topography of Athens he has rendered valuable service.

MARTIN L. D'OOGHE.

P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon Libri XV, Lactanti Placidi qui dicitur Narrationes Fabularum Ovidianarum recensuit, apparatu critico instruxit HUGO MAGNUS. Accedunt Index Nominum et tres Tabulae Photographicae. Bero-  
lini, apud Weidmannos, MDCCCXIV. 8vo., 766 pp.  
30 M.

Those who for the last twenty years have had occasion to follow the work of Professor Magnus will welcome with open arms this careful and complete critical edition of the Metamorphoses of Ovid. Without meaning in the least to detract from the work of his predecessors we may safely assert that this is the first critical edition of Ovid's great narrative poem really worthy of the name. And besides being important in itself, the work was also sorely needed. The textual tradition is peculiarly difficult, and the greatest formal artist in Roman poetry, the greatest story-teller of Rome, one of the greatest of all the world, has waited quite too long for his share of editorial attention. Here for the first time, the reader when in doubt, can consult a complete and comprehensive critical apparatus at the foot of the page. He may not be able to resolve his doubt, but—and this is more than hitherto has been possible—he will at least have the complete history of the problem before him.

The contents of the book are,—The Praefatio (pp. I-XXXIV), in which the editor discusses the MSS, critical subsidia, and similar matters concerned with the textual tradition; a Conspectus Siglorum (pp. 1-4); the Text and Critical Apparatus (pp. 5-624); the text of the Narrationes of Lactantius Placidus (pp. 625-721); and Index Nominum compiled by Paul Klink (pp. 722-766); three facsimiles of one page respectively of the Marcianus, 225=M, the Neapolitanus, IV F 3=N, and the Marcianus, 223=F.

As this must be a brief notice rather than an extended review, I cannot do better than to summarize briefly the editor's discussion of the textual tradition.

Ovid himself says (*Trist.* 1, 7, 37; 3, 14, 21) that at the time he was banished the poem was still unfinished, and not yet published. Pohlenz (*Hermes*, 28, 1. ff.) contends that he completed the *Metamorphoses* in exile, and made some changes which he hoped might influence Augustus to remit his punishment. If so, we might guess that two such passages, for example, as 3, 141-2 and 15, 822 ff., go back to the copy which the poet appears to have sent to Augustus (*Trist.* 2, 557), and the question arises whether certain other readings in our MSS are due to copies of the poem made before Ovid left Rome—he says himself that he destroyed one copy—or to the usual carelessness of later times. Magnus, and apparently with good reason, concludes that up to the poet's death and for some time afterwards, the poem was kept alive by being copied privately, and that the text thus propagated, and for that very reason steadily becoming more and more corrupt, was the only one known to Seneca and to everyone else until nearly the end of Antiquity. At about that time there appears to have arisen an editor of considerable ability who emended the text and published it with a commentary. This may be gathered from occasional references in the *Narrationes* of Placidus which were attached to this particular edition. There are also references to it in the *Mythographi Vaticani*, Probus (*Verg. G.* 1, 399), Servius, and Vibius Sequester. Some copies of this class (M=Codex Marcianus Florentinus, 225, saec. XI, containing Books I to XIV, 830, and N=Codex Neapolitanus, IV F 3, saec. XI, containing I to XIV, 838) accompanied by the *Narrationes* lasted until the Middle Ages. Magnus designates it by O (i. e., the consensus of M and N). Meanwhile, the text of the old vulgate also continued to live, in fact, it is to the vulgate that we owe the preservation of the last 13 lines of the 14th and the whole of the 15th Book. This class Magnus designates by X (i. e., the consensus of F=Codex Marcianus Florentinus, 223, saec. XI ex. and all or nearly all the later MSS collated by the editor himself and by others).

Further it is clear that there never was a time when the *Metamorphoses* was reduced to a single copy. We cannot speak of an archetype in the ordinary sense of the word. This, of course, has an important bearing on the constitution of the text. How far, after the Carolingian period, classes O and X were affected by collation of one with the other it is impossible to determine, but Magnus concludes that this is not an important factor in the problem, inasmuch as before the habit assumed serious proportions, i. e., before the 12th cen-

tury, the O class as such had ceased to live. Hence, his principles for constituting the text are:

1. Whenever O and X disagree, O has the greater authority. If we follow X, we must support our choice with proofs drawn from every possible source—the sense demanded by the passage, a thorough-going examination and comparison of Ovidian usage in language, metrical form, etc.

2. Whenever M and N, i. e., the representatives of the O class, disagree in such a way that one or the other follows the reading of X, we must attempt to discover why this is the case, and to determine whether the reading is due to a scribal error or has crept in from some other source by way of a correction, a gloss, an interpolation, or the like.

3. Where the reading of O appears to be false or corrupt or interpolated, X is to be preferred, but not unless the reading of X is supported by F, the best MS of the class. Readings of X unsupported by F are apt to be later interpolations of the 12th century and after.

4. Verses or parts of verses omitted by O—the reasons for it are generally evident—should never be bracketed unless it can be demonstrated that as they stand they are certainly not Ovidian.

5. There is no great opportunity or reason for conjectural emendation in the *Metamorphoses*. It should be indulged in sparingly and with great caution. To change the text of A (i. e., the general consensus of O and X) is tantamount to changing the text read by the ancients themselves and by them transmitted to the Middle Ages.

6. The text of the *Metamorphoses* as we now have it is practically the same as that of the Carolingian period. There is no foundation for undertaking another recension unless we find—as perhaps we may, the possibilities, so far as Ovid is concerned, are not yet exhausted—some MS of the family now represented only by the unique *Fragmentum Bernense* (about the middle of the 9th century) or some copy of the O class containing XIV, 838 to the end of the poem, the portion now found only in X.

In the matter of orthography Magnus has followed the usual standard of later times except in cases where manuscript authority plainly supports the old norm of the Augustan Age. The result, of course, is a certain amount of inconsistency, but I for one am in entire sympathy with his conservative attitude, at all events, so far as an edition like this is concerned. One would like to see a classic spelled as the author himself spelled it, and, as a rule textual tradition is notoriously untrustworthy in this respect, but the path of any man who undertakes to restore contemporary orthography is beset with pitfalls of every sort.

A notable and valuable feature of this edition is the fact that here for the first time a critical apparatus of the *Metamorphoses* is accompanied by a complete collection of the *Testimonia Veterum*. And a comparison of the testimonia taken from the *Carmina Epigraphica* with those listed in the index of Buecheler's text suggests that Magnus' collection of testimonia has been carefully sifted. Naturally, the range of actual quotation and verbal reminiscence is in no way comparable with that which characterized the later tradition of Vergil. For one thing, Ovid did not receive the same tonic of pedagogical recognition. At the same time quotation and verbal reminiscence are undeniably less extensive than at first thought many of us would have guessed, indeed, some curious results were derived from statistics which, as a matter of curiosity, I myself made on the basis of Magnus' material. Testimonia increase as we approach the Middle Ages, but they were never as numerous as the undoubted eminence of the author would lead us to expect. For example, careful readers of Seneca the Philosopher get the impression that he had a fondness, I had almost said a sneaking fondness, for Ovid. To be sure, he does make fun of him at the close of the *Apocolocyntosis*. This, however, does not militate against the impression. On the contrary, for that very reason we might well suspect that Seneca was as careful and sympathetic a reader of the *Metamorphoses* as, for example, was Cervantes of the romances of chivalry. It now appears that Seneca is the largest individual contributor to the testimonia collected by Magnus. No less than 37 cases are found, and, what is also significant, they are taken from all parts of the poem, not from the first few pages or from some given episode. We all know what that means. Of course, the testimonia of Magnus apply only to the *Metamorphoses*, but it is more than likely that if we had a similar collection of testimonia for all the works of Ovid we should still find that Seneca was at or near the head of the line. Indeed, by way of his father he had a sort of inherited association with the great poet of the later Augustan Age.

But Seneca is an exception. The very first line of his nephew's epic is clearly an echo of *Metamorphoses*, 12, 583, but unless I am mistaken this is the only case recorded by Magnus for the entire *Pharsalia*, and he finds but one each in Petronius, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus, and but two each in Statius and Juvenal. Six are found in Quintilian and eight in Martial. Even the epitaphs yield only a few undoubted cases. The nearest approach to Seneca is Lactantius (19 cases). But Lactantius belongs to the type who read the classics only 'to contradict and confute'. Testimonia, however, increase as we approach the Middle Ages, but they are

never so numerous as the undoubted eminence of the author would appear to demand.

The fact is, however, that Ovid's commanding position in the literature of the world is largely due to at least two aspects of his genius the influence of which is not revealed by such indicia. One of these is his command of metrical technique, the other, his ability to tell a story. The former is his greatest gift to Antiquity, the latter is the basis of his supreme importance in the aesthetic evolution of the Modern World. But in both cases what he really did passed into the communal fund of acquired ability, and the author of it became, as it were, 'depersonalized'. Hence the ancients forgot their debt to Ovid, just as we for the most part have finally forgotten ours. As a metrical artist, however, Ovid takes his place among the great poets of the world. In this respect he did for Roman poetry what Cicero had already done for Roman prose; he found it more or less local, and left it capable of universal use for an indefinite period. And when at the Renaissance we moderns at last outgrew the *Chanson de Gestes*, which babbled on like a brook through an entire pedigree, and the *Roman d'Aventures*, the incidents of which could be predicted in advance, and the *Fabliau* which, to say the least, was nothing new, we turned, with rare discrimination, to the greatest story-teller of the Roman world, we sat at the feet of the man who, as Mackail well says, 'fixed a certain ideal of civilized manners for the Latin Empire and for Modern Europe', and learned from him as best we could what it is that makes a story immortal and always young.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

---

The Guipuscoan Verb of the Year 1713, found in the Catechism of J. Ochoa de Arin; An Analytical and Quotational Index made by E. S. DODGSON, M. A. An Offprint of 83 Pages from Numbers 36, 37, 38 and 39 of *Hermathena*. At the University Press, Trinity College, Dublin, November 19, 1913.

Well known is the exceptional interest which belongs to Bascolological investigation. The Baskish tung, isolated in classification, is the last specimen of the languages spoken in Europe before the Aryan invasion; and is by general consent set down as one of the most difficult languages in the world, if not the most difficult. And, whilst the theory of the